

of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of "all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto", and "all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities";

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to "carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities" and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the "destruction, removal or rendering harmless" of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including "by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means";

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine

United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 574, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is debating the very profound question of war and peace and the structure and nature of international relations in the 21st century.

Before us today is the serious and fundamental question of life and death: whether or not this Congress will give the President authority to commit this Nation to war.

Always a question of the greatest importance, our decision today is further weighted by the fact that we are being asked to sanction a new foreign policy doctrine that gives the President the power to launch a unilateral and preemptive first strike against Iraq before we have utilized our diplomatic options.

My amendment provides an option and the time to pursue it. Its goal is to give the United Nations inspections process a chance to work. It provides an option short of war with the objective of protecting the American people and the world from any threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

The amendment urges the United States to reengage the diplomatic process, and it stresses our government's commitment to eliminating any Iraqi weapons of mass destruction through United Nations inspections and enhanced containment.

It emphasizes the potentially dangerous and disastrous long-term consequences for the United States of codifying the President's announced doctrine of preemption.

The administration's resolution forecloses alternatives to war before we have even tried to pursue them.

We do not need to rush to war, and we should not rush to war. If what we

are worried about is the defense of the United States and its people, we do not need this resolution.

If the United States truly faced an imminent attack from anywhere, the President has all of the authority in the world to ensure our defense based on the Constitution, the War Powers Act and the United Nations Charter.

Our own intelligence agencies report that there is currently little chance of chemical and biological attack from Saddam Hussein on U.S. forces or territories. But they emphasize that an attack could become much more likely if Iraq believes that it is about to be attacked. This is a frightening and dangerous potential consequence that requires sober thought and careful reflection.

President Bush's doctrine of preemption violates international law, the United Nations Charter and our own long-term security interests. It will set a precedent that could come back to haunt us.

Do we want to see our claim to preemption echoed by other countries maintaining that they perceive similar threats? India or Pakistan? China or Taiwan? Russia or Georgia?

I would submit that we would have little moral authority to urge other countries to resist launching preemptive strikes themselves. This approach threatens to destabilize the Middle East, unleash new forces of terrorism and instability and completely derail any prospects for peace in the region.

Unilateralism is not the answer. Iraqi weapons of mass destruction are a problem to the world community, and we must confront it and we should do so through the United Nations. Multilateralism and steadfast commitment to international law should be the guiding principle as we move into the 21st century.

As I said, the purpose of my amendment is to let the United Nations do its work. Let us give inspections and other containment mechanisms a chance to succeed once again. Inspections did make real progress in eliminating weapons of mass destruction in the 1990s despite Saddam Hussein's best effort at obstruction and deceit. U.N. inspectors destroyed large stockpiles of chemical weapons, missiles and weapons of mass destruction. We can and should renew and expand this process.

In addition to inspections, we should improve border monitoring through an enhanced containment system to prevent shipments of nuclear materials or other weapons to Iraq. And we should install surveillance technology on the border to detect such materials.

As part of enhanced containment, we should work with the countries bordering Iraq and with regional seaports to ensure that United Nations Security Council resolutions are enforced, and we should plug holes in the current arms embargo blanket. We should also work on nonproliferation efforts globally to secure weapons materials.